

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed October 29, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1-27. By way of the foregoing amendments and the markings to show changes, Applicants have canceled claims 1-27, and have added new claims 28-55. No new matter has been added. The foregoing amendments are taken in the interest of expediting prosecution and there is no intention of surrendering any range of equivalents to which Applicant would otherwise be entitled in view of the prior art.

I. Examiner Telephone Interview

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Douglas Hess for the time and courtesy extended to Applicant's Representative during a telephone Examiner's Interview conducted on February 28, 2008. In that interview, proposed replacement drawings were discussed. The Examiner stated that the replacement drawings appear to overcome the 37 CFR 1.83(a) objection. It was also discussed the rejection under 35 USC Sec. 112, wherein Applicants pointed to several sections of the specification (e.g., paragraphs 0021-0023, 0045-0048, 68, 71, and 81) that disclose the "detection means" and a "controller" and their connection to the drives with respect to the "first and second data" in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, thereby overcoming the rejection. Furthermore, in that interview, the particular operation of the present invention and a proposed claim 28 were also discussed. The Examiner stated that the proposed claim 28 appears to overcome the 35 USC 102(b) rejection, however, a further search by the Examiner may be necessary. On this basis, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of the claims be withdrawn and also request that the claims be allowed.

Further, by the present amendment, it does not follow that the amended claims have become so perfect in their description that no one could devise an equivalent. After amendment, as before, limitations in the ability to describe the present invention in language in the patent claims naturally prevent the Applicants from capturing every nuance of the invention or describing with complete precision the range of its novelty or every possible equivalent. See, Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., 62 USPQ2d 1705 (2002). Accordingly, the foregoing amendments are made specifically in the interest of expediting prosecution and

there is no intention of surrendering any range of equivalents to which Applicants would otherwise be entitled.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of Applicants' amendments and remarks, the Examiner's rejections are believed to be rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and requests that the Examiner pass the case to issue at the earliest convenience. Should the Examiner have any question or wish to further discuss this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (248) 292-2920.

If for some reason Applicant has not requested a sufficient extension and/or have not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent the abandonment of this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge our Deposit Account No. 50-1097 for any fee which may be due.

Dated: 2/2, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



David A. Zdurne
Registration No. 58,630
DOBRUSIN & THIENNISCH PC
29 W. Lawrence Street
Suite 210
Pontiac, MI 48342
(248) 292-2920

Customer No. 25215